DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 322 UD 021 393

AUTHOR Kramer, Mary Jo
TITLE Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 30p.
AVAILABLE FROM Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, P.O. Box 1010, Manchester, CT 06040 ($3.50); E. Bourque, 214 Main Street, Southport, CT 06490 ($3.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; Elementary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Instructional Improvement; Organizational Effectiveness; School Community Relationship; Staff Development; *State Boards of Education; *Student Improvement; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the implications of research on effective schools for professional development at the State and local levels. The first part of the paper gives an overview of the research and a description of the characteristics of instructionally effective urban elementary schools. The paper then explores how these characteristics can be applied to inservice programs within schools. Issues discussed in this section include: (1) school and teacher expectations; (2) supervision and evaluation of instruction and teacher performance; and (3) community relations and communication. Ths paper concludes with recommendations for professional development that can be initiated by a State education agency. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210322

APPLYING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By
Mary Jo Kramer
Connecticut State Department
of
Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Jo Kramer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD021393

APPLYING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

by
Mary Jo Kramer
Connecticut State Department
of Education

Over the past two decades, public education has not been able to demonstrate that it has met the expectations of urban parents that their children would learn, if not everything, then at least the traditional school skills of reading, writing and arithmetic. Aggregate scores of basic skills achievement in the cities indicate that poor and minority students perform dismally lower than their middle-class peers.[1] Recent studies, however, have identified urban elementary schools which counter the gloomy prognosis that poor, city children are unlikely to attain proficiency in basic skills.

Ronald Edmonds, the foremost American author of this research, has defined these schools as "instructionally effective" insofar as they "bring children of the poor to those mimimum masteries of basic school skills that now describe the successful pupil performance for children of the middle class." Closely aligned with the expectations of urban parents, Edmond's standard requires "early acquisition of those basic skills which assure pupils successful access to the next level of schooling."[2] However modest this standard may seem, it surpasses American education's current record in teaching the urban poor.[3]

To the degree that American education is seriously committed to increased standards of achievement and greater equity for poor children, the research findings presented by Edmonds and many others offer a promising--

ED213963

if not compelling--prospect for professional development in urban schools. The research on instructionally effective schools points to a clear direction for formulating the purposes and premises of professional development plans and programs. Furthermore, since the research has shown that these schools consistently exhibit a discreet set of characteristics, state and local educators need not flounder in their search for inservice priorities to enhance the learning of urban students.

The purpose of this paper is to examine implications of the effective schools research for professional development at the state and local levels. The first part of the paper will give a brief overview of the research and a description of the characteristics of instructionally effective schools. That will be followed with illustrations of how these characteristics can be applied to inservice programs within schools. The paper will conclude with recommendations for professional development that can be initiated by a state education agency.

Part I

AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Conventional wisdom in American education maintains that family background and social class are the principal determinants of pupil performance in schools. [4] This premise is underscored by three major studies.

First, statistical correlation between the socio-economic status (SES) and the school achievement of students was found in the 1966 Coleman Report. Since none of the school-related variables that were tested indicated similar statistical significance, Coleman concluded that SES caused the low-achievement of poor and minority students. [5] Later Daniel Moynihan and

and Frederick Mosteller conducted the second study, a reanalysis of Coleman's findings which confirmed his conclusions.[6]

The third study, Inequality, was made by Christopher Jencks and his colleagues in 1972; it repeated Coleman's earlier findings and concluded that schools have minimal effect upon redressing societal inequities.[7] Without a massive redistribution of income, the contemporary American poor, unlike the 19th and 20th century immigrants, could no longer expect that a sound education would help them achieve greater access and opportunity in American society.

At least three deleterious side effects of this research influenced American policy and practice during the late sixties and seventies. First, policy makers could draw the conclusion that schools were doing about as much as could be expected for poor children.[8] Arthur Jensen had arrived at a similar finding. His article, published in 1969, posed the question, "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" When reduced to its essential point, the answer offered by Jensen was, not much.[9]

A second, related, implication was that current pedagogy was inadequate to bring about successful instruction of poor students. Jencks, for example, had stated: "We see no evidence that either school administrators or educational experts know how to raise test scores..."[10]

The third side effect of the research was the initiation of federal policies and programs founded on the premise that low-income students were culturally deprived. Behavioral differences were equated with deficits stemming from the values and environment of the children's home and community.[11]

But even as these ideas shaped American policy over the last decade, a persistent group of social scientists began to present studies which refuted the Coleman, Moynihan, Mosteller and Jencks research. These studies

began to identify city elementary schools which demonstrated differing levels of achievement while serving analogous pupil populations. Once the schools were identified, the researchers analyzed and described the characteristics which differentiated the high- and low-achieving schools. Weber, Madden, Brookover and Lezotte were among the pioneers of this type of research design which was further refined and expanded by Ron Edmonds and his colleagues in their current study, The Identification and Analysis of City Schools that are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children.[12]

The research on effective schools proposed and substantiated a set of premises and findings which stand in sharp contrast to the former conclusions about the likelihood of learning achievement for the urban poor. Generally, these differences cluster around two points.

First, the effective schools research overcame the failure of earlier studies to identify urban schools which successfully instructed students in basic skills. In identifying effective elementary schools, the researchers have conveyed an unambiguous message. The fact that these schools exist challenges the validity of the assumption that basic skills matriculation for poor children is beyond the reach of urban schools. In other words, we can no longer presume that urban schools are doing as much as could be expected for poor children nor that family background and social class are insurmountable obstacles. As Edmonds has stated, "We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest and we already know more than we need to know to do so."[13] A straightforward logic supports his statement. If some elementary schools, however few, effectively teach the urban poor, then it is possible for other schools serving similar populations and using currently available pedagogy to do likewise.

Second, in contrast to The Coleman Report and Inequality, the effective schools research analyzed the interaction of professionals with students within the school milieu thereby identifying the prominent administrative and instructional variables which influenced pupil achievement in the effective schools. According to Edmonds, five variables are the consistent characteristics of instructionally effective schools:

1. Strong Administrative Leadership

Most frequently, the leadership within effective schools emanates from the principal. Brookover and Lezotte found that the principal exercises this leadership by interpreting the school's mission to staff, providing guidance and support to students and staff, establishing communication procedures between parents and staff, and by supervising and monitoring pupil progress and staff performance.

2. High Expectations

Edmonds states that effective schools demonstrate "a climate of expectation in which no student is permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement."[14] Lezotte concurs adding that the teachers and administrators believe that they have the capacity to deliver the required instructional program. The characteristic of high expectations means, therefore, that the schools uphold both the capability of the teacher to teach and of the learners to learn.

3. Clear School Mission with an Emphasis Upon Basic Skills

According to Edmords, effective schools direct time and resources to basic skills instruction which takes precedence over all other activities. Lezotte and Brookover describe this characteristic as a clearly articulated mission of the school whereby staff share an understanding and commitment to goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability. The two researchers also found that at effective schools, staffs observe and monitor

instructional time on task and often re-examine school policies, priorities and practices to assure their consistency with school goals.

4. Frequent Pupil Progress Monitoring

Pupil progress is frequently monitored in effective schools through some means ranging from traditional practices of testing on the day's lesson, to more sophisticated methods of criterion reference or standarized assessment used by a school system.

5. Safe and Orderly Environment

Without being rigid or oppressive, the atmosphere of effective schools is conducive to teaching and learning.[15]

In summary then, the effective schools research conducted by Edmond's and his colleagues demonstrated that some urban elementary schools have been able to instruct poor children so that their performance in reading and math was at or above average standards of achievement. These instructionally effective schools gave consistent evidence of explicit characteristics of school climate and practice.

Finally, if any one theme could be considered central to the studies of effective schools, it is the conclusion that pupil family background and social class neither causes nor precludes instructional effectiveness at the elementary level for the urban poor. Said more simply, the fundamental responsibility of schools to provide successful instruction in basic skills cannot be relieved nor excused because the children are poor.

Part II

APPLYING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS RESEARCH TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN URBAN SCHOOLS

With the effective schools research as a foundation, the priorities for staff development for urban educators are fairly clear. Of the five characteristics, I will isolate two--high expectations and leadership--as central for inservice activities in urban schools. My discussion of these priorities, however, will include references to the other characteristics of instructionally effective schools as well.

HIGH EXPECTATIONS: THE CORE OF AN INSERVICE PROGRAM

From the characteristics of high expectations flows at least two themes for professional development within urban schools: setting goals and recognizing cultural differences. Although I refer to establishing, clarifying and monitoring school goals and objectives as "goal setting", it is an ongoing process which encompasses various professional growth activities. In other words, rather than equating professional development with workshops and training sessions, my definition includes such activities as committee work, planning meetings, and visitations to other schools and classrooms.

Setting School Goals Based on High Expectations

Most institutions, both private and public, subscribe to the notion that goals are not only important but essential. The educational enterprise is no different. Most, if not all of the Connecticut's professional organizations and school districts, as well as its state agency, have goals which describe aspirations for student learning.[17] If an individual school does not have a set of goals, it can easily borrow or synthesize them

from another source. But whatever the origin, the point is that the foundation of an ongoing inservice program aimed to make schools more instructionally effective is goals for student learning.

Depending on the preferences of the school staff, the process of establishing goals can range from a highly complex one to a straightforward endeavor. Many goal-setting kits are commercially available, and while I do not advocate any single procedure, the process should be structured to examine and define the school's expectations for student achievement in basic skills.[18] A few caveats may illustrate that this task is not as simple as it seems.

Learning Expectations

Among the difficulties associated with goal-setting is the problem of a staff reaching an agreement on the applicability of goals to all children in the school. The field of education is inclined to set forth lofty, egalitarian goals. Yet somewhere hidden in the crevices of our minds are a series of qualifications. While a goal may promise that "all students will learn to read", such a statement is frequently accompanied with a parenthetical qualification like "except for the kids who are not motivated, have a bad attitude, or come from poor homes". These familiar expressions illustrate commonly held exceptions to accomplishing school goals. But as Lezotte reminds us, "The effective schools' research stresses the belief that all--not a few, not most, but all--students are expected to learn."[19] An inservice program therefore should help a staff become cognizant of explicit or implicit qualifiers in order to build a shared understanding of learning expectations for all students in the school.

One way of articulating expectations is to translate the basic skills goals into school improvement objectives which measure overall expectations

for student accomplishments. Similar to the Connecticut State Board of Education's Objectives for Public Education, a school improvement objective might read, "During the coming year, the school will demonstrate a 10% increase in math achievement as indicated by ..."[20]

Over-arching yet specific objectives of this kind could also be developed by committees of staff for primary and intermediate levels, or for each grade and classroom. The purpose of defining school improvement objectives is not to reinvent the wheel by developing a scope and sequence of skills. Without meaning to disparage the importance of a skill continuum, it must be said that comprehensive and technical descriptions can preclude parental understanding of a school's learning expectations for students. As free from jargon as possible, school improvement objectives are intended to clarify, strengthen and communicate expected learning accomplishments to all involved in educating the school's pupils.

Similar to the process of setting school improvement objectives is that of predicting mid- or end-of-year achievement results. Through this activity a staff may question, for example, whether it is reasonable to expect that the students' progress in reading will be commensurate with months they are enrolled in school. A prediction process can also uncover instructional problems which require attention if the students are to make continuous progress in basic skills. After these problems are identified, subsequent inservice sessions could be used to plan appropriate remedies or to develop additional knowledge in basic skills instruction.

Prediction exercises and setting school improvement objectives are but two of the many ways to translate abstract goals into learning expectations for each and every child in a school. For a school to develop a sense of direction and commitment consistent with the effective schools' research, its inservice program should reinforce the importance of high

expectations for all students through its goal-setting process.

Emphasis on Basic Skills Goals

Both Edmonds and Lezotte have found that the foremost mission of effective schools is teaching basic skills. Since most sets of school goals include various other learning aspirations, the thorny question is how to emphasize basic skills goals amidst the many expressed aims and demands of an urban school. This predicament deserves careful consideration in the school's inservice program.

One initial method is to prioritize the school goals. For example, a hypothetical forced-choiced question could be posed to the school staff like, "By the end of 6th grade, would you prefer a student to have: a) illiterate academic skills and high social skills, or b) high academic skills and minimal social skills?" Since it is highly unlikely that any five educators would unanimously choose one or the other choice, the answers to this question and the reasons supporting the answers become both revealing and thought provoking. But more important, the question illustrates that emphasizing basic skills may be confounded by the complex values and sometimes conflicting practices of contemporary public education. If poor children in our cities are to achieve basic literacy by the time they leave elementary school, then that task may demand a reordering of priorities. At the least, an urban school staff should be encouraged to reach some unanimity on how they are going to emphasize basic skills achievement in their school.

As priorities for school goals are expressed, a staff can begin to examine whether these priorities are consistent with the allocation of time and resources within the school. One inservice session, therefore, could result from the work of a staff committee which inventories how school time and materials are directed to instruction in reading and math.

Through this kind of inservice endeavor, obstacles to emphasizing basic skills achievement can be identified and resolved. The school staff, for example could find that class changes, nutritional programs, disciplinary events, and school services have produced an overload of classroom interruptions and dwindling instructional time. Similarly, a policy review might reveal inadequate coordination among the classroom and special programs. For example, students may be going to a Title I tutor during the time set aside for basic skills instruction in their regular classroom. Rather than providing additional instruction in basic skills, the special program becomes a substitute for the lessons within the classroom.

Another inservice session could focus on classroom practices aimed to increase the amount and quality of time spent in basic skills instruction. This requires an ability to differentiate between learning objectives which can be accomplished by students independently, either alone or in a small group, and those which necessitate direct instruction by the teacher. A review of the amount and quality of instructional time could also entail re-examining the consistency between a stated learning objective and the instructional activities used to achieve that objective. A particular game or coloring activity, for instance, may be inappropriate to accomplish a word recognition objective intended by the teacher.

Although these inservice activities may seem overly obsessed with the use of school and classroom time, the fact remains that educational research has fairly consistently showed a strong correlation between time-on-task and student achievement.[21] If urban schools are to become more effective by emphasizing basic skills, then it follows that time should be an important consideration in an inservice program. As Lezotte has stated, "The teacher is the final and real policy maker." When the classroom door closes, practical applications of goals begin to operate and compete for a meager four

or five hours of instructional time. Unless school, program and classroom policies clearly support and emphasize basic skills instruction, the students' opportunities to learn can easily be eroded.[22]

High Expectations by Recognizing Cultural Differences

Conventional wisdom still clings to the notion that poor city children are culturally deprived. Furthermore, as documented in the 'Pgymalian' research, academic failure is both expected and accepted when the students are poor, black, or otherwise different from prevailing white middle-class norms. And as Eliza Dolittle captured in her remark "I'll act like a lydie when you treat me like a lydie," expectations do make a difference.[23] The second aspect of an inservice program centered on high expectations, therefore, is the responsiveness of urban schooling to the cultural differences of poor children and their parents.

Professional growth for school teachers and administrators on this topic could be pursued through at least two different types of inservice activities: those aimed to improve classroom and instructional practice, and those aimed to improve school policies and programs.

Before illustrating these activities, let me preface my remarks with an important caveat. Much of the inservice work that has been done on cultural differences has been of the group awareness variety. In other words, the inservice training is intended to heighten professional sensitivity to cultural differences. Much of the corresponding research on this approach, however, has not been able to show that it has greatly modified the daily behavior of professionals. I use this evidence not to say that consciousness-raising activities are useless--on the contrary, they serve an informational purpose of considerable value--but rather to underscore the point that inservice training should be directed towards how educators behave in schools and classrooms.[24]

Prejudice towards racial, class and ethnic characteristics pervades American society. School professionals are no different, nor should a prejudice-free mind be a requirement of their employment. It's how they *act* towards children who are culturally different that is the crux of an inservice program. As Edmonds stresses, the difference between ineffective and effective schools is not the family background of the pupils, but the school's response to that family background.[25]

Inservice Activities Aimed to Improve Classroom-Instructional Practices

An initial inservice aim should be to familiarize people with the difference versus deficit interpretations of family background and social class. A variety of multi-media materials, case studies, simulations and articles are available to do this. Similarly, a cadre of national and state experts can provide a thought provoking examination of cultural differences and their application to daily instructional practices. But all of these activities should be structured in such a way that specific teacher behaviors are expected.

A few illustrations may bring home this point. George Spindler, of Stanford University, has compiled a set of ethnographic case studies on cultural understanding. One of these studies, *Beth Anne*, demonstrates how common cultural perceptions can cloud a school staff's ability to design an appropriate learning program for a student.[26] If a case study of this kind were presented in an inservice training session, a follow-up activity could be having each teacher identify his or her perceptions about various students and modify classroom practices accordingly.

Changes in the language used in referring to children and their parents may also be necessary. As Murray Edelman has pointed out, calling students "culturally deprived" as opposed to socially and economically oppressed speaks to vastly different perceptions which permeate professional

practice.[27] Similarly, when students are reprimanded with disparaging remarks about their ethnicity or parents, the school is conveying the message that the child's heritage and community experiences are considered deviant, counter-productive, or worthless.

Inservice activities on cultural differences should also call for alterations in instructional objectives as seen by examples from current classroom practice. Teachers, misinterpreting linguistic differences, spend time teaching the concept of possessives which a child already knows. A readiness objective that states that 'children will learn that things have names' ignores the speaking vocabulary of poor pupils, who know that things have names even if they do not know the names of farm animals found in Dick and Jane readers. A picture of a thimble is used to teach the "th" sound when thunder, thumb, throw, or thirst could suffice, and correspond to the student's experiences at the same time. Schools still abound with materials that reflect suburban or nostalgic rural American living, and that inaccurately portray the historical interaction among classes and ethnic/racial groups, as if making low-income children like their middle-class peers is a greater priority than effective instruction which provides requisite skills.

Endless time is spent using methods that work with more affluent children without taking the pragmatic stance: If it doesn't work, use something else. Ron Edmonds makes the same point: "One of the cardinal characteristics of effective schools is that they are as eager to avoid things that don't work as they are committed to implementing things that do."[28]

Inservice Activities Aimed to Improve School Policies and Curriculum Programs

According to Edmonds an effective school recognizes "the necessity of modifying curricular design, text selection, teaching strategies and so forth in response to differences in family background among pupils in the school."[29] His conclusion suggests the usefulness of another form of inservice activity focused on cultural differences.

Workshop sessions could be structured to engage teachers in applying standards of cultural diversity and student interests to the selection of assessment and instructional materials. School policies such as the use of IQ measures and expectancy formulas, could be questioned and revised. A number of research studies have illustrated both the cultural bias inherent in these practices and their negative effect on maintaining high expectations for students.[30]

Inservice training could also be a vehicle to examine whether the criteria for students entering special programs reflect cultural deprivation premises. Similarly, the school's responsiveness to poor urban parents could be the subject of an inservice session. Among the topics which could be explored would be the school's policies and practices for conferring with parents, reporting student progress, and involving parents in basic skills instruction.

At other inservice sessions, the focus could be exemplary programs and model practices which have resulted in exceptional progress in basic skills for poor children. Successful methods and strategies employed by the teachers within a school could also be shared with the total staff. These sessions could play an invaluable role in developing an effective curriculum. The underlying purpose, however, is not necessarily to replicate another endeavor--although borrowed ideas and methods may be most fitting--but to illustrate that urban pupils can indeed learn basic skills.

In conclusion, then, the effective schools research indicates that urban schools should strive for instructional competence and school policies that are responsive to poor students and their parents. With this aim in mind, inservice programs should reinforce high expectations by translating a respect for cultural differences into school and classroom practices.

The importance of this task cannot be overstated. First, instruction

based on the premise of cultural deprivation--since it assumes the legitimacy of family background and social class as the causes of academic failure--permits educators to abrogate their responsibility for the successful learning of low-income students. Secondly, the meaning of equality of education ultimately resides in schools and classrooms. For some it means that all children are treated the same, for others all children should learn in a manner fitting to their needs.[31] But if public instruction is to be democratic and achieve its egalitarian goals, then family income or characteristics such as the color of one's skin, cannot be considered the proper basis for distributing societal goods and services.

INSERVICE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

The second professional growth implication of the effective schools' studies is leadership training for school principals. Educational research has consistently highlighted the importance of the principal as the instructional leader in a school. According to Brookover and Lezotte, some of the leadership functions exercised by principals in effective schools are: interpreting the school's mission to staff, providing guidance and support to students and staff, establishing communication procedures among staff and parents, and supervising and monitoring pupil progress and staff performance.[32] An inservice program for principals, therefore, should develop leadership skills in at least three areas:

1. School Planning and Self-Assessment
2. Supervision and Evaluation of Instruction and Teacher Performance
3. Community Relations and Communication.

School Planning and Self-Assessment

An ongoing process of setting and interpreting school goals requires that a principal be adept in identifying the obstacles which undermine the

accomplishment of stated aims and learning objectives. The principal should have the necessary skills to detect instructional and learning problems whether they originate from organizational design, curriculum or classroom practices. Inservice training sessions which use case studies or actual school circumstances are one way to fine tune these observation and problem-solving skills. For example, one such case study could describe a group of students whose instruction in phonics and word recognition did not result in the desired learning. Similarly, principals could be presented with a series of teaching/learning difficulties and asked to develop remedies appropriate to their school. The following example illustrates the kind of problem which could be posed to principals in inservice sessions:

Aggregate reading scores for the district indicate that the rate of progress of elementary students sharply declines after the primary grades. Identify instructional remedies for your school and show how you will work with your intermediate grade staff to improve learning.

Another series of inservice sessions could focus on school procedures to assess pupil progress. Familiarity with various methods of monitoring student's achievement (e.g. criterion and standarized systems, informal inventories, unit and teacher-prepared tests, lesson plans) would be a useful aim of an inservice program for principals. Developing inservice plans and activities for a school staff could be the purpose of another series of inservice sessions.

Supervision and Evaluation of Instruction and Teacher Performance

Ideally, a principal is the master teacher--the staff's in-house resource person. But if a principal cannot analyze a lesson and effectively communicate his/her observations to teachers, then the staff and ultimately the children are denied the benefits of careful and constructive supervision. Inservice for principals, therefore, should develop skills in assessing

whether daily, monthly and yearly instruction accomplished its intended learning results. In other words, as a principal observes a class or visits classrooms, he or she should be able to identify the learning objective and the follow-up methods of reinforcement and evaluation for a particular lesson. The ability to ask specific questions about the purpose of a lesson and a teacher's assessment of it is also a necessary skill. For example, one principal interviewed by Lezotte said he told his staff that every instructional decision a teacher makes should consider the questions, "How will this help facilitate learning in reading, writing and arithmetic?"[33] Administrative skill associated with asking and answering this type of question could be improved through an inservice program.

Similarly, an inservice activity could be designed to assist principals in preparing observation reports in objective and prescriptive terms for both staff and central office uses. Due process provisions in supervising, evaluating and documenting teacher performance should also be addressed during these inservice sessions.

This topic borders on another aspect of inservice for principals: teacher evaluation. Too often, teacher evaluation is clouded by vague, general descriptions. The simple word 'good' covers a multitude of teacher behaviors ranging from style, management, attitude, appearance, professional participation and cooperation, to learning results for students. Sometimes, however, teacher evaluation forms demonstrate a preoccupation with personnality and process over product.

Product may be a bitter pill for educators to swallow, but however it is said, learning is integral to teaching and therefore cannot be ignored in teacher evaluation. Teaching simply does not happen in empty rooms--someone is supposed to be learning. A fair set of criteria for teacher evaluation, then, should center on the heart of the school program: instruction and learning. This task could be the focus of many inservice

sessions for principals.

Community Relations and Communication

The complexity of urban life does not stop at the schoolhouse door. Whether for good or ill, the life within an urban school is interwoven with the life within its surrounding community. Sometimes, however, a city school tries to operate as if it is an oasis isolated from the community. Ultimately, the principal is responsible for bridging school and community life. Community relations and communication, then, are an important agenda item for a principal's inservice program.

Such a program should aim to increase the principals' skills in reading and assessing their communities so that they can tap its resources and establish better communication with parents. Among the skills which could be developed is the ability to identify sources of power and conflict, services and resources, and avenues for solving school-related problems. For example, a principal could gain familiarity with procedures for initiating volunteer programs or improving the reporting and conferencing components of a school program. Similarly, a principal could learn about methods of using parental and community resources to strengthen school governance and disciplinary codes. Both of these examples are in line with the characterization of effective schools as places where the environment is safe, orderly, and responsive to parents.

In summary, then, an inservice program for school principals could support and enhance instructional leadership skills in school planning and assessment, supervision and evaluation, and community relations. These three areas have been highlighted because of their consistency with the effective schools research as well as with the previous suggestions for staff development in urban schools. But whatever topics are most appropriate for a particular district, the fact remains that instructional leader-

ship is a crucial variable for improving the effectiveness of urban schools. Inservice for school principals, therefore, should be foremost among the priorities for staff development in urban districts. As Lezotte concludes from his studies, "Either the principal provides instructional leadership or no one seems to."[34]

Part III

CONCLUSIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

If urban schools are to become instructionally effective for poor children, then there should be two clear priorities for a professional development program. The first, high expectations for pupil achievement in basic skills, can be advanced through an ongoing process of setting and interpreting school goals. Inservice sessions which guide a school staff in determining the priorities of goals, establishing objectives for school improvement and emphasizing basic skills by reallocating time and resources are among the ways to clarify and strengthen the school's mission of instructional effectiveness for each and every student. High expectations also translate into school and classroom practices which are both fitting and responsive to poor city children and their parents. An inservice program, therefore, should aim to develop an urban staff's recognition of cultural differences with corresponding modification of the professional behavior reflected by teaching strategies, curricula, school policies, instructional objectives and so forth.

The second priority consistent with the effective schools' research is inservice for principals. A professional growth program could concentrate on the skills necessary to exercise leadership in school planning and assessment, supervision and evaluation, and community relations.

Various workshops and resource people are available to help an urban district improve these and many other skills which comprise instructional leadership.

With these priorities in focus, what then can a state agency do to assist urban schools in becoming instructionally effective for poor children?

The Connecticut State Board of Education has recently completed a Comprehensive Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education which includes professional competence as one of the state agency's four major goals over the next five years. This newly stated commitment could mean that the state will follow an obvious route of offering inservice programs for urban teachers and administrators. Undoubtedly, these sessions are worthwhile, particularly when they serve an informational purpose of bringing exceptional research and practice to the attention of Connecticut's educational community. But a state agency has a unique role in the schooling enterprise. With its accessibility to organizations, institutions and agencies throughout Connecticut, the agency can offer statewide services and opportunities which are not feasible at the local level. In performing this important function, the State Board of Education could act as a broker of resources and sponsor activities which promote instructionally effective schools.

Specific to professional development, at least four possibilities come to mind. The first is to initiate a statewide network of resource people who demonstrate expertise in one or more of the aspects of staff development cited in this paper. Establishing this network, which would include a talent pool of teachers and administrators, would entail procedures for making these experts available for inservice programs within urban schools. A similar type of network is already underway as part of the state department's five year plan for professional development of school administrators.

A second professional growth initiative for the agency would be the development of Leadership Training Centers in each urban area in the state. Whether based at a higher education institution or regional service agency, these leadership centers could provide intensive school effectiveness training for principals, and sponsor an internship program for prospective building administrators. These centers could also serve as clearinghouses of model programs and practices and of nationally recognized consultants to aid urban schools in initiating inservice which is consistent with the effective schools' research. Assistance to urban districts in organizing inservice for principals could be offered as an additional service of these centers.

As a third staff development endeavor, the state could arrange joint sponsorship of an effective schools' inservice program with one or more professional organization, teacher center or regional service center. Similarly, the state could encourage the initiation of inservice and preservice courses, practicums, or internships in instructionally effective schooling at one or more higher education institution.

A fourth service provided by the state would be a simple competitive grants process to provide urban schools with a small amount of seed money for their inservice programs. Similarly since one of Connecticut's Title IV priorities is staff development, the state agency could prepare guidelines to assist school districts in establishing innovative inservice programs aimed to strengthen the instructional effectiveness within urban schools.

All of these efforts are geared to coalesce various statewide resources for inservice in urban schools. The point is that if urban educators are determined to make their schools more instructionally effective, then the state's rich resources should be accessible and available for professional development at the local level.

In keeping with this direction, the state's role in gathering and publishing information can also support local inservice plans. For example, the state could sponsor a serie of effective school guides. These how-to inservice models could be prepared on such topics as setting and interpreting school goals, increasing time and opportunities for basic skills learning, developing instructional strategies responsive to cultural differences, and initiating leadership training for principals. As another way to aid in-service within urban schools, the state agency could identify instructionally effective schools and programs for poor children through a pilot research project or a set of criteria for local districts to use in assessing their schools and programs. A publication describing these exemplary schools or an ongoing 'effective schools newsletter' could be distributed throughout the state. Similarly, a compilation of nationally recognized effective schools and inservice programs would be useful to urban teachers and administrators.

And finally, the state could make available a cadre of educators who are skilled in assessing the instructional effectiveness of an urban school and in assisting its staff in planning a school improvement program. Similar to New York City's School Improvement Project, this kind of resource team could be a valuable asset in helping a school develop an inservice program.

Thus, the Connecticut State Board of Education could undertake a series of school improvement initiatives which befit its role and are consistent with its goal of ensuring professional competence. But equally important, actions such as these would foster a stronger commitment to equity for Connecticut's urban students. To borrow Ron Edmonds' definition, equity is "a simple sense of fairness in the distribution of primary goods and services that characterize our social order."[35] By this standard of equity, schooling is a public service which should strive to function in a manner

benefiting as many students as possible. At the least, equity means meeting a fundamental expectation of urban parents that their children will learn to read, write and count. Some urban schools embrace this challenge, while others continue to flounder. And yet under Connecticut law, the state's responsibility remains crystal clear:

To provide each child with equal opportunity to receive a suitable program of educational experiences.[36]

Professional development solidly grounded in better learning for poor city children, then, is no less than a noble and responsible aspiration for Connecticut.

FOOTNOTES

[1]M.J. Wargo and P.L. Campeau and G.K. Tallmadge, Further Examination of Exemplary Programs for Educating Disadvantaged Children. (Palo Alto: American Institute of Research, 1971); Harvey A. Averch. et. al., How Effective is Schooling: A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings. (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1972); U.S. Office of Education, Statistical Report Fiscal Year 1968: A Report on the Third Year of Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970); Gene Glass, Data Analysis of the 1968-69 Survey of Compensatory Education (Title I). Final Report. (Boulder, Colorado: Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado, August, 1970); Milbrey W. McLaughlin, Education and Reform: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Cambridge,MA.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1975); U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Comptroller General's Report to the Congress. Assessment of Reading Activities Funded and the Federal Program of Aid for Educationally Deprived Children. (Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, Dec. 12, 1975). For a review of urban achievement in Connecticut see Connecticut Assessment of Educational Progress: Summary and Interpretations 1976-77 (mathematics) and 1978-79 (reading).

[2]Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor". Educational Leadership. (October, 1979), pp. 15-16.

[3]Ibid., p. 15

[4]Ibid., p. 21. For a historical perspective, see David B. Tyack, The One Best System. (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1974); For examples of early twentieth century educators who promoted pluralistic, community schools see Angelo Patri, A Schoolmaster of a Great City. (New York: Mac Millan Co., 1971); Leonardo Covello, The Heart is the Teacher.

[5]James S. Coleman, et. al., Equality of Educational Opportunity. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1966).

[6]Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, editors. On Equality of Educational Opportunity. (New York: Random House, 1972.)

[7]Christopher Jencks et. al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972)

[8]For a general criticism of research studies see Sarane S. Boocock, Students, Schools and Educational Policy: A Sociological View. (Aspen Institute Paper, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1976); Ronald Edmonds, "A Response to the IEA Findings on the Relationship of School Achievements to Differences in the Background of Children." Educational Policy and International Assessment. ed. by Alan C. Purves and Daniel U. Levine, (Berkley, CA.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), pp. 104-107; For a specific criticism of Inequality see Ronald Edmonds et. al., "Perspectives on Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America." Harvard Education Review. 43:1, (February, 1973), p. 78.

[9]Aurthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Education Review. 39 (Winter, 1969). pp. 1-123; A.R. Jensen, "Heritability and Teachability." Emerging Issues in Education: Policy Implications for the Schools. ed. by J. E. Bruno, (Lexington, MA., 1972) pp. 57-88.

[10]Jencks, Inequality. p. 93.

[11]For a review of the literature about deprivation see Helen L. Bee, A Developmental Psychologist Looks at Educational Policy. (Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1976). For an example of scientific basis and extension from studies of animals, see H.F. Harlow and M.K. Harlow, "Social Deprivation in Monkeys." Scientific American. 207 (1962); For additional review of literature see Meridith A. Larsen and Freya E. Dittman, Compensatory Education and Early Adolescence: Reviewing Our National Strategy. Research Report Prepared for Assistant Secretary of HEW. (Menlo Park, CA.: Stanford Research Institute, May 1975). For criticism of the deprivation premise, see Stephen S. Baratz and Joan C. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism." Harvard Education Review. 40:1 (Winter 1970) pp. 29-50; Basil B. Bernstein, "A Critique of the Concept of Compensatory Education." Functions of Language in the Classroom. ed. by Courney Cazden et. al., (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972), pp. 135-154; For specific examples in school practice see Annie Stein, "Strategies for Failure." Harvard Education Review. 41:2 (May 1971), pp. 158-204. Ronald Edmonds, Cultural Democracy. Report of the 1970-71 Michigan Project, Improving State Leadership in Education. (East Lansing, MI.; Michigan State Dept. of Education, 1971).

[12]For a complete overview of the research on effective schooling, see Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." pp. 15-23.

[13]Ibid., p. 23.

[14]Ibid., p. 22

[15]Ibid., p. 22. For a summary of Lezotte & Brookover's research, see Lawrence A. Lezotte, "A Policy Prospectus for Improving Urban Schools." (Prepared for Connecticut State Department of Education, Comprehensive Plan Project, July, 1979).

[16]Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." p. 21

[17]Connecticut State Board of Education. "Comprehensive Plan for Elementary and Secondary Education. (Hartford, Connecticut; January, 1980) pp. 13-4

[18]For a discussion about articulating school goals and purposes to school client and constituents, see Ronald Edmonds, "Alternative Patterns for the Distribution of Social Services." Equality and Social Policy. ed by Walter Fineberge, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press; 1978). For examples of goal setting kits, contact Phi Delta Kappa or Dr. Richard Manatt, Iowa State University. See also, staff development model prepared for ASCD's National Curriculum Institute by Karolyn J. Snyder.

[19]Lezotte, "A Policy Prospectus for Improving Urban Education." p. 6

[20]For illustrations of the type of objective, see Connecticut SBE's Comprehensive Plan, pp. 25-8

[21]David Wiley and Annegret Harnischfeger, Explosion of a Myth: Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction. Studies of Educative Processes, Report No. 8 (Evanston, Illinois: University of Chicago, Dept. of Education, 1974), p. 8.

[22]Lezotte, "A Policy Prospectus for Improving Urban Education." p. 7.

[23]While the early literature on expectations can be attributed to Matina Horner's work on women, the bulk of education research examines expectations for low-achieving pupils, particularly those who are poor or black. See Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupil Intellectual Development. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968); Raymond C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy of Ghetto Education." Harvard Education Review. 40: 3 (August, 1970) pp. 411-450, and the sources cited therein. Kenneth B. Clark, A Possible Reality. (New York: Emerson Hall, 1972); Doris R. Entwisle et. al., Expectation Theory in the Classroom. Final Report to the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University, Dept. of Social Relations, 1974); see also Rist and Rosenthal already cited; N. Hobbs, The Future of Children. (San Francisco: Jossey-Base, 1975). For a review of the literature and an analysis of teacher expectations in urban schools see, Patrick Proctor, The Design, Rationale, and Validation of an Urban Teacher Attitude Inventory. Unpublished dissertation (University of Massachusetts, 1973).

[24]For additional illustrations of school policies and practices as well as inservice activities related to the behavior of professionals towards cultural differences see, Mary Jo Kramer, The Administration of a Successful Title I Program. Unpublished Qualifying Paper (Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.,1976).

[25]Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor", pp. 21-23

[26]George D. Spindler, "Beth Anne— A Case Study of Culturally Defined Adjustment and Teacher Perceptions," Education and Cultural Process, ed. by G.D. Spindler, pp. 139-153. For an illustrative sample of the literature in this area see, George C. Spindler (ed.), Education and Cultural Process, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974); Implications for reading instruction can be found in Kenneth Goodman and J.T. Fleming, Psycholinguistics and the Teaching of Reading. (Newark, N.J.: International Reading Association, 1969.)

[27]Murray Edelman, "The Political Language of the Helping Professions," Politics in Society. 4:3 (1974), p. 296.

[28]Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," p. 21

[29]Ibid.

[30]For a critical review of I.Q. testing see, Ronald Edmonds and Evlyn K. Moore, "I.Q., Social Class and Educational Policy." Change Magazine of Higher Learning. (Oct., 1973), pp. 12 + 64; Jerome Kagan, "A Conversation with Jerome Kagan." Saturday Review of Education. (August, 1973), pp. 41-43; J. Kagan, "Inadequate Evidence and Illogical Conclusions." Harvard Education Review. 39:2 (Spring, 1969) pp. 274-277. J.R. Mercer, "I.Q.: The Lethal Label." Psychology Today. 6: 4 (1972) pp. 44-47, 95-97.

[31]Lezotte, p. 6.

[32]Ibid. p. 6. For a review of the literature on leadership functions of principal see, Margaret Thomas, The Study of Alternatives in American Education. Vol. II: The Role of the Principal. Prepared for the National Institute of Education (Rand Corporation: Santa Monica, CA., 1978), pp. 1-2. For additional interpretations see, William Georgiades, "Renewal: A Must for Principal/Instructional Leader." Thrust for Educational Leadership. 9:3, (January, 1980) pp. 5-7; Mildred Ness, "The Administrator as Instructional Supervisor." Educational Leadership. 37:5 (February, 1980) pp. 404-6; Seymour Sarason, "The Principal and the Power to Change." National Elementary Principal. 53:5 (July-August, 1974), pp. 47-53.

[33]Lezotte, p. 6.

[34]Ibid. p. 6

[35]Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." p. 15

[36]Connecticut State Department of Education, Conn. Laws Concerning Education. Section 10-4a (Hartford, Connecticut: January, 1979) p.3